

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
AT CHARLESTON

	X	
FRANK MORGAN,	:	
	:	Civil Action
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	No. 2:18-cv-01450
	:	
v.	:	
	:	Date: July 29, 2020
LOGAN COUNTY COMMISSION,	:	
et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	X	

PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS HELD
DURING JURY TRIAL - DAY 2
BEFORE THE HONORABLE THOMAS E. JOHNSTON, CHIEF JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
IN CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

KERRY A. NESSEL, ESQ.
The Nessel Law Firm
519-1/2 Eighth Street
Huntington, WV 25701

ABRAHAM J. SAAD, ESQ.
Saad Law Office
P. O. Box 1638
Huntington, WV 25717-1638

For the Defendants:

WILLIAM E. MURRAY, ESQ.
Anspach Meeks Ellenberger
Suite 1700
900 Lee Street East
Charleston, WV 25301

WENDY E. GREVE, ESQ.
Pullin Fowler Flanagan Brown &
Poe
901 Quarrier Street
Charleston, WV 25301

Court Reporter: Ayme Cochran, RMR, CRR
Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography;
transcript produced by computer.

1 PARTIAL PROCEEDINGS had before The Honorable Thomas E.
2 Johnston, Chief Judge, United States District Court,
3 Southern District of West Virginia, in Charleston, West
4 Virginia, on July 29, 2020, as follows:

5 (Outside presence of jury)

6 THE COURT: The plaintiff may return to the
7 witness stand.

8 MR. NESSEL: Your Honor, I have one brief issue
9 real quick, if I may.

10 THE COURT: Can the plaintiff go to the witness
11 stand in the meantime?

12 MR. NESSEL: Oh, sure. Yeah. I don't see why
13 not. It's not going to affect what I'm about to say.

14 THE COURT: By the way, just so you know, my court
15 reporter's father is a retired barber. So, we had some
16 laughs this morning about what happened in the barber shop
17 when she was growing up.

18 MR. NESSEL: I was wondering about that. Well,
19 there you go.

20 THE COURT: There you go.

21 All right.

22 MR. NESSEL: If I may, Your Honor, briefly.
23 During questioning of witnesses, Ms. Greve was bringing up
24 what I consider 404(b) evidence. No notice of intent to
25 introduce 404 was ever filed by anybody. She's bringing up

1 criminal charges that have been dismissed, that were never
2 pursued. She's bringing up a robbery charge; likewise,
3 never pursued. This is character evidence and is clearly
4 outside the scope. She cannot -- there is no reason she
5 should bring it in.

6 Now, the charges pertaining to the events that
7 transpired on April 20th of 2018, that should be admissible
8 because, of course, Frank pled to three of the ten to twelve
9 misdemeanors. However, bringing up his prior criminal
10 history, I think, is irrelevant, highly prejudicial,
11 confuses the jury because there's no -- if there were a like
12 -- if there were a like charge concerning obstruction of an
13 officer, beating an officer, that would likely be fair game.
14 However, there's not, and what she's bringing up is just
15 charges that have been dismissed, that have been pursued.
16 Some of them, of course, he pled guilty to. I don't think
17 -- I think that falls outside the parameters, exceptions, to
18 404(b).

19 Thank you, Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Ms. Greve?

21 MS. GREVE: Thank you, Your Honor.

22 In plaintiff's complaint, plaintiff alleges that he
23 sustained physical injuries from contusions, lacerations,
24 abrasions and psychological and emotional injuries,
25 including, but not limited to, PTSD, anxiety, depression,

1 agoraphobia, insomnia, and other related and severe
2 injuries.

3 The witness has been involved in numerous other
4 instances throughout his life that could be alternative
5 explanations for PTSD, the injuries he allegedly sustained
6 on April 20th, 2018. That could also explain the cause of
7 anxiety and depression.

8 It was plaintiff's counsel who elicited from this
9 witness, as well as Marissa Hudson, the history of drug
10 abuse and drug use and, specifically with this witness, he
11 testified that he hadn't been using drugs and the only drugs
12 that he used was crack cocaine. He had been off it with one
13 exception of when he tested positive. I believe he said
14 that was within the last year. And so, we believe that has,
15 in fact, opened the door to his history of drug abuse.

16 The Court has already --

17 THE COURT: Well, you're mixing the issues here.
18 He's not talking about drug abuse.

19 MR. NESSEL: Not at all.

20 THE COURT: I've already ruled on that. He's
21 talking about other uncharged or un-convicted crimes, which
22 I think is a different issue.

23 MS. GREVE: Well --

24 THE COURT: And you went into this robbery thing
25 yesterday.

1 And, by the way, you didn't object.

2 MR. NESSEL: I know, Your Honor. I was --

3 THE COURT: And so, I think, you know, we've gone
4 a little ways down that road, but now that he's raised the
5 issue, I think you need to justify how you get into that.

6 MS. GREVE: So, the robbery, Your Honor, there
7 were statements that Mr. Morgan was involved in a fight.
8 The individual who could hear the fight going on actually
9 thought it was a fight between he and Marissa and, when they
10 open the door, they saw that Frank Morgan had another
11 individual down on the ground and was beating him while
12 holding a knife to that individual's throat.

13 We believe that it's possible that Mr. Morgan could
14 have sustained lacerations and/or abrasions while involved
15 in that fight that was less than 48 hours before the
16 incident in which he alleges that every -- every part of his
17 body was injured by the officers.

18 THE COURT: Well, a fight is one thing. You got
19 into some business about a robbery.

20 MR. NESSEL: That's my whole point, Your Honor.
21 There's no -- Ms. Greve is going into things where she has
22 no evidence, no witnesses, she's not disclosed documents, or
23 she's not disclosed any witness that can testify exactly to
24 what she just said and it's irrelevant anyway.

25 THE COURT: Well, to the extent that she has tried

1 to demonstrate that there were circumstances on a different
2 date that may have led to the injuries that are depicted in
3 all of these photographs, I think that's relevant.

4 However, I do not think you get to get into matters
5 that would be considered 404(b) material because you've
6 given no notice of it. So, I don't -- I think you -- to the
7 extent that you want to insinuate that he's committed other
8 crimes that don't relate to -- that can't somehow explain
9 those injuries, I'm not going to let you do that.

10 MS. GREVE: What about with respect to his felony
11 convictions, for his character for truthfulness, and what
12 about his time while he was incarcerated for evidence with
13 respect to his anxiety, depression, PTSD and emotional
14 distress?

15 THE COURT: Well, I think I previously ruled that
16 with regard to his psychiatric conditions, assuming you can
17 lay a foundation, you can cross examine him about that.

18 What was the other thing? There was something else you
19 said.

20 MS. GREVE: So, it's the time period of
21 incarceration. He's claiming agoraphobia.

22 THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry.

23 MS. GREVE: Agoraphobia is one of the claims that
24 he's made in his complaint, is an injury resulting from his
25 -- this incident on the 20th, and I believe that that opens

1 the door and the general emotional distress claim we
2 discussed of his time period of incarceration prior to this
3 incident.

4 He's also claimed that he's now afraid of law
5 enforcement and he has anxiety issues. I think that opens
6 the door for us to discuss what contact he's had with law
7 enforcement and what that interaction is since this arrest.

8 And I also believe that I can, without getting into
9 whether or not he's been criminally charged with things, I
10 can get into matters about whether or not Mr. Morgan was
11 engaged in acts that would be consistent with his injuries
12 and could cause emotional distress.

13 THE COURT: Well, nobody's got an expert on the
14 psychological injuries, right?

15 MR. NESSEL: That's right, sir.

16 THE COURT: So, the only testimony we're going to
17 get about that is through him. So, you're stuck with
18 whatever you get out of him. And I've already ruled on
19 that.

20 With regard to his fear of law enforcement, he did
21 testify about that. I think it's -- I'll let you go a
22 little ways into that for time subsequent to this incident
23 because I think he has opened the door to that, but if we
24 get into a full-throated examination about other criminal
25 charges, I'm going to stop you. So, just -- there's a line

1 to be drawn there. And I'm not sure where it is, but you
2 know now that we're going to be coming up to it.

3 And, finally, there's the question of prior
4 convictions. I don't know what his criminal history is. I
5 gather he has a felony conviction; is that correct?

6 MR. NESSEL: In 1999, 21 years ago.

7 THE COURT: All right. Well, let's take a look at
8 the -- this is not a criminal case, so the rules are a
9 little different.

10 MR. NESSEL: Yes, sir. I understand that.

11 THE COURT: How many convictions do you intend to
12 get into as a matter of impeachment?

13 MS. GREVE: Well, Your Honor, I was actually
14 trying to limit it for time reasons. The first issue I do
15 certainly want to address because plaintiff's counsel -- the
16 first question that was asked of Mr. Morgan was the night he
17 was in jail and the response was that he had his home
18 confinement revoked. So, the first charges I want to bring
19 up are the actual charges while he's incarcerated.

20 He's not incarcerated because his home confinement is
21 revoked. He's incarcerated because he has pending criminal
22 charges. We believe those criminal charges are also
23 admissible because they rebut some of the other testimony
24 that has come from Mr. Morgan.

25 THE COURT: There are pending criminal charges?

1 MS. GREVE: Yes, there are.

2 THE COURT: So, what's -- he hasn't been convicted
3 of that, so how are you going to get into that?

4 MS. GREVE: Mr. Nessel, I believe, opened the door
5 to that when he asked Frank Morgan why he was wearing an
6 orange jumpsuit and why he was incarcerated. Mr. Morgan's
7 response was that he was incarcerated because his home
8 confinement was revoked, because he had gone to cash the
9 money that was on his card, and that home confinement had
10 told him that he was okay for him to go cash the money that
11 -- to cash that, but he had just went further than was --
12 than they allowed.

13 That is not why he's incarcerated. He is incarcerated
14 because he has pending criminal charges. He had been
15 allowed to serve part of that on home confinement. The home
16 confinement was revoked because he breached the terms of his
17 home confinement.

18 THE COURT: So, he was bonded out on home
19 confinement and it was revoked because he breached the
20 terms. I think -- so, what's the pending charge?

21 MR. NESSEL: Your Honor, if I may, I have a little
22 bit of insight. It's a 20-B number, 20-B-92 in Logan County
23 Circuit Court. As this Court knows, the "B" denotes a
24 bound-over case; ergo, he's not indicted.

25 THE COURT: Can you guys take your masks off when

1 we're talking because I don't understand you.

2 MR. NESSEL: Okay. It's a 20-B-92 or 42 case
3 that's a bound-over case, which means Mr. Morgan has not
4 been indicted. I'm not exactly sure exactly what the charge
5 is pending right now. I know that -- I don't care if Ms.
6 Greve gets into the issue of violating the terms and
7 conditions of home confinement, as I brought it up
8 yesterday. That's fair game. But why he's incarcerated on
9 a bound-over case, not being indicted, and darn sure not
10 being convicted, I think that's off limits.

11 THE COURT: Do you know what he is charged with?

12 MS. GREVE: He is charged with possession with
13 intent to deliver fentanyl. He is charged with possession
14 with intent to deliver methamphetamine. And he's charged
15 with felon in possession of a firearm.

16 THE COURT: Okay. Now, tell me how it is that you
17 get past the fact that he got revoked, which he's already
18 testified to, and get to -- and get to cross examine him on
19 being charged but not convicted of that.

20 MS. GREVE: Because the question that was asked of
21 him is why he was incarcerated and it's not because home
22 confinement was revoked. He's incarcerated because he has
23 pending criminal charges.

24 THE COURT: You know, I rarely do this, but I am
25 -- I will allow you to explore the revocation. The hair

1 you're splitting there, Ms. Greve, unfortunately, I'm
2 extremely familiar with because of the criminal cases that I
3 do.

4 The answer is both of -- both are correct. He's got
5 pending charges, so he's incarcerated, but he's incarcerated
6 at the moment because he violated his bond and -- however,
7 it opens the door to a lot of potentially prejudicial
8 material to get into what he's charged with, especially when
9 he hasn't been convicted of it.

10 So, I am -- I am going to exclude that under Rule 403
11 on the basis that its probative value is substantially
12 outweighed by the risk of unfair prejudice, delay and a
13 waste of time.

14 MS. GREVE: And can I just proffer for the record
15 and the Court, as well, that this individual has testified
16 that he doesn't do meth? He doesn't -- and I believe his
17 attorney is going to start bringing up fentanyl and I think
18 that the criminal charges for dealing methamphetamine and
19 dealing fentanyl are relevant.

20 And this is also evidence --

21 THE COURT: Well, that's -- the criminal charges
22 prove nothing because they are just charges, number one.
23 And, number two, it's entirely possible to sell fentanyl and
24 not use it. So, it is -- I will add to the list of 403
25 reasons that I'm excluding it, the potential for confusion

1 or misleading of a jury. If you want to keep arguing, I can
2 add some more bases for my ruling.

3 MS. GREVE: No. I just wanted to note. I just
4 wanted to note.

5 So, that's -- this reflects a law enforcement
6 interaction that he's had since this incident, but that is a
7 law enforcement interaction that you're ruling I can't get
8 into?

9 THE COURT: Well, if the whole goal of that is to
10 get into what the charge is, no. If you want to talk about
11 some sort of circumstance related to his arrest and not get
12 into the charge, that's fine. I don't know where that's
13 going. I'm not privy to the discovery, so I don't know
14 where you're going with that. I don't know what's going to
15 come out of that.

16 MS. GREVE: Well, if I ask this witness how much
17 time he's been out of jail from May of 2018 until now and
18 how much -- and in that period how much interaction he's had
19 with law enforcement, if he doesn't respond truthfully, can
20 I not bring up the arrests and not -- I don't have to say
21 that he was arrested. I don't have to say that there was a
22 criminal charge. But I do have a criminal complaint sworn
23 by a law enforcement officer and can I not bring that up?

24 THE COURT: Mr. Nessel?

25 MR. NESSEL: Your Honor, there's a tremendous

1 difference between interactions with police officers and
2 correctional officers. If anybody in this room knows more
3 than anybody, it's probably me and Mr. Murray. We've had
4 several cases together.

5 And correctional officers, it's a confined society
6 inside with cameras, so on and so forth.

7 THE COURT: Well, hold on. You're not talking
8 about correctional officers?

9 MS. GREVE: No, Your Honor.

10 MR. NESSEL: Well, he just -- his interactions
11 with them on the one time without bringing up the charges.
12 I mean, if his claim is that he's frightened of police
13 officers, rightfully so, I suppose.

14 But my point is, is that if Ms. Greve is going into
15 have you been confronted by police officers since April 20th
16 of '18, I think she can do that, but not going into any
17 charges.

18 THE COURT: Well, I think that's what I just said.

19 MR. NESSEL: You did.

20 THE COURT: Yeah. I don't know where this is
21 going exactly, but --

22 MR. NESSEL: I don't either.

23 THE COURT: I'll be prepared to put the brakes on
24 it if I think it's going somewhere it shouldn't.

25 MS. GREVE: So, now the other is that plaintiff's

1 counsel elicited from Mr. Morgan that he pled guilty to
2 battery on a law enforcement officer because it was a
3 trade-off of -- I think it was represented that there were
4 15 other charges.

5 MR. NESSEL: Ten other.

6 MS. GREVE: The plea actually dealt with a
7 dismissal of claims from two cases. I would like to
8 introduce all of the charges that were dismissed in exchange
9 for the plea. The majority -- all of the charges except one
10 came from this incident. The other charge was a 2019
11 incident, but it's part of the plea which has been made part
12 of the record and the door has been opened to that, Your
13 Honor.

14 MR. NESSEL: They're dismissed. Dismissed
15 charges. The disposition of those charges is complete
16 dismissal. Therefore, ergo, he was found not guilty of
17 them, Your Honor.

18 I do a lot of criminal law. This Court is far more
19 advanced than I am in it.

20 THE COURT: Well, I think she's right on this one.

21 MR. NESSEL: Okay.

22 THE COURT: I think you opened the door to that
23 pretty wide, actually. So, I will let her explore that.

24 MR. NESSEL: Yes, sir.

25 THE COURT: And that's -- you know, yeah, I'll let

1 her explore that.

2 MR. NESSEL: Okay. Thank you, sir.

3 THE COURT: Anything else?

4 MS. GREVE: Well, when we're talking about his
5 felony convictions, this is a civil matter, and if I ask
6 this witness how many felony convictions he's had and he
7 doesn't remember, how far am I allowed to go in refreshing
8 his recollection?

9 THE COURT: Well, you can refresh recollection
10 appropriately the same way any other witness would have
11 their recollection refreshed about any other document.

12 MS. GREVE: So, is it going to be permissible for
13 me because I am on cross examination to actually cross
14 examine him and if he doesn't remember that he was an
15 escaped felon in Ohio that I can refresh his recollection
16 with that?

17 THE COURT: You -- you can.

18 MS. GREVE: Do I --

19 THE COURT: If you do it appropriately, yes.
20 There's a right way to do that and a wrong way to do that.

21 MS. GREVE: Well, this is cross exam, but I don't
22 -- given the Court's rulings, I don't want to state the
23 conviction in my question if that -- if you're ruling that
24 would be improper.

25 THE COURT: That's exactly what I'm ruling.

1 MS. GREVE: Okay.

2 THE COURT: You show him the document. You say,
3 "Does this refresh your recollection?" If it does, it does.
4 If it doesn't, it doesn't. And then, if it does, then you
5 can ask him, okay, what is that and you -- but until then,
6 until his recollection is refreshed, I don't think you get
7 to get into it.

8 MS. GREVE: Okay.

9 THE COURT: Now, one thing I want to ask, and I
10 haven't -- it's been awhile since I've encountered this.
11 Let me take a look at this real quick.

12 MS. GREVE: Sorry. There was one other matter
13 that I did want to get into and I want to make sure that
14 there is a --

15 THE COURT: Go ahead. I'm trying to find the
16 Rules of Evidence in this book. Go ahead.

17 MS. GREVE: After this complaint was filed or
18 around the time -- actually, around the time that this
19 complaint was filed there were -- a month before this
20 complaint was filed, there were domestic battery and assault
21 charges brought by Marissa Hudson against Frank Morgan.
22 The -- I would like to ask Mr. Morgan about the facts that
23 were underlying that assault and I do believe that that's
24 relevant.

25 I think the assault of his key witness here is an issue

1 that the jury can decide, if that was a credible occurrence
2 or not. Now, of course, he can deny it happened, but I
3 would like to be able to present him with the facts.

4 MR. NESSEL: That's clearly not admissible under
5 404(b). That case was dismissed.

6 Again, I allowed Ms. Hudson to address it yesterday. I
7 was kind of -- how do I say it? I was kind of patient,
8 which is out of character for me, if you know me. I think
9 that it -- considering it was dismissed and there's no
10 conviction of it and it's irrelevant to any assault on a
11 police officer or his claims in this case, I think it's
12 inadmissible, Your Honor, and overly prejudicial, as well.

13 THE COURT: Refresh my recollection about what Ms.
14 Hudson's testimony was on that.

15 MS. GREVE: Ms. Hudson said that she would have
16 never sworn out a complaint against Frank Morgan, that she
17 didn't remember him assaulting her. Then, when I reminded
18 her that she was at the hospital, she said, yeah. Well,
19 yeah. Maybe.

20 THE COURT: Let me take a look at a couple things
21 here.

22 MS. GREVE: And the door is -- this was not
23 objected to at all by Mr. Nessel, whether it's
24 characteristic of him or not.

25 MR. NESSEL: With one witness, as opposed to the

1 other. That's the distinction with that.

2 MS. GREVE: I think the argument that it's
3 prejudicial is gone since it's already out there in front of
4 the jury. So, with respect to relevancy, I think whether or
5 not the plaintiff criminally assaulted and battered their
6 key witness, who the jury already knows had been financing
7 him with her prostitution money, I think that really
8 addresses credibility.

9 THE COURT: Well, let me address that first. I
10 think that the relationship between -- between Ms. Hudson
11 and Mr. Morgan is sort of central to the testimony in this
12 case. Her testimony on it was equivocal at best and I think
13 I'm going to allow you to cross examine Mr. Morgan about it.
14 And I believe that it is not in this case a collateral
15 matter and, therefore, extrinsic evidence of it is
16 allowable. So, I will allow that.

17 Now, with regard to criminal convictions, have you
18 complied with Rule 609(b) with regard to his past
19 convictions?

20 MS. GREVE: I don't know what 609(b) requires me
21 to do, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Well, I will read it to you. Mr.
23 Nessel indicated that Mr. Morgan's felony conviction was
24 from 1999. Do you know when he got -- what was the
25 conviction for?

1 MR. NESSEL: One moment, Your Honor. I have his

2 --

3 MS. GREVE: His drug dealing. That was the Gary,
4 Indiana charge.

5 MR. NESSEL: It was actually with intent, sir.

6 THE COURT: And how long was he incarcerated?

7 MR. NESSEL: I'm not sure.

8 THE COURT: Mr. Morgan?

9 MR. MORGAN: Six years.

10 THE COURT: Six years? All right. So, when did
11 you get out?

12 MR. MORGAN: Out in '97.

13 THE COURT: You got out in '97?

14 MR. MORGAN: Yes.

15 THE COURT: I thought you said that -- Mr. Nessel
16 said the conviction was in '99.

17 MR. MORGAN: In '99? The one in Ohio or Indiana?
18 I got out of prison in '97. '92 to '97.

19 MR. NESSEL: So, '92 was the conviction; '97 would
20 be when you were released?

21 MR. MORGAN: Yes.

22 MR. NESSEL: That's right. You were like 20 years
23 old or 18.

24 There you go, Your Honor. That clears everything up.

25 THE COURT: All right. So, Rule 609(b) says that

1 this subdivision (b) applies if more than ten years have
2 passed since the witness's conviction or release from
3 confinement for it, whichever is later.

4 Evidence of the conviction is admissible only if, one,
5 its probative value supported by specific facts and
6 circumstances substantially outweighs its prejudicial
7 effect; and, two, the proponent, that would be you, Ms.
8 Greve, gives an adverse party reasonable written notice of
9 the intent to use it so that the party has a fair
10 opportunity to contest its use.

11 Have you given Rule 609(b) notice?

12 MS. GREVE: Not with -- not with felonies more
13 than ten years old, the more recent ones, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: All right. Well, then anything more
15 than ten, years old is out. You cannot even cross examine
16 him about it because you didn't give notice.

17 MS. GREVE: Okay.

18 THE COURT: So, what crimes are you specifically
19 intending to cross examine him about?

20 MS. GREVE: The -- and I'm referring to an NCIC
21 report. I'm not claiming to have personal knowledge of his
22 convictions. The report reflects an escaped felon
23 conviction, March 2007; felony burglary convicted -- and
24 these are in Ohio -- March, 2007. Oh, that's more than ten
25 years old. Sorry.

1 THE COURT: I was just thinking that. Well, it
2 depends on when he got out of custody.

3 MS. GREVE: Well, I don't know. I don't know.

4 MR. NESSEL: If he was at all in custody. May I?
5 I'm reading 609 with you, Your Honor.

6 Your Honor, in all actuality, I mean, we live in 2020.
7 There's internet everywhere. All Ms. Greve had to do was,
8 pursuant to Rule 9, advise me of it, do research, go to the
9 DOC in whatever state, whatever commonwealth, and determine
10 how long he was in. That's her burden. She didn't do it.

11 MS. GREVE: Your Honor, there's no -- I mean --

12 MR. NESSEL: That's where we are.

13 MS. GREVE: Mr. Nessel had a PI run a list of
14 prior convictions. They don't match everything in the NCIC.
15 But, in any event, if it's older than ten, I'm not fighting
16 about that. I'm not fighting about that.

17 THE COURT: Well, then --

18 MS. GREVE: I don't know when he got out on the
19 2007 charges in Ohio.

20 THE COURT: Then it's out.

21 MS. GREVE: I'm sorry?

22 THE COURT: Then it's out. I mean, this is
23 something that should have been -- this is one of those
24 instances that I tell you about at the pretrial conference.
25 You all should have raised this issue and dealt with it long

1 before we were in trial. We've had a jury sitting back
2 there a half an hour now and we're dealing with an issue
3 that we could have dealt with before trial, Ms. Greve.

4 So, have you got anything else you want to cross
5 examine him about that's not ten years old that's a felony?

6 MS. GREVE: Or a crime of dishonesty?

7 THE COURT: Or a crime of dishonesty.

8 MS. GREVE: I do not think so. Well, petit
9 larceny, is that a crime of dishonesty? I think so. Right?

10 THE COURT: Petit larceny.

11 MR. NESSEL: Your Honor, technically any crime is
12 a crime of dishonesty.

13 THE COURT: Well, as you well know, Mr. Nessel,
14 there is a body of case law that sorts through what is a
15 crime of dishonesty under 609 and what's not. It would have
16 been lovely to have some notice of this issue before now so
17 we weren't thrashing around with it. So, what's your
18 position on it?

19 MR. NESSEL: It's out. That doesn't fall into the
20 parameters. I was inflicting some sarcasm there about
21 crimes of dishonesty.

22 THE COURT: If you haven't figured it out, I'm not
23 in the mood for sarcasm.

24 MR. NESSEL: Yeah. I do understand that. Your
25 Honor, just to defend myself, you know --

1 THE COURT: I'm not -- I'm not saying -- my
2 complaint here is that Ms. Greve didn't do her homework,
3 didn't make notices, didn't raise these issues when she
4 should have.

5 MR. NESSEL: Yes, sir.

6 THE COURT: Not complaining about you. What I'm
7 at this point irritated with is the fact we've got a jury
8 sitting back there waiting and we're still dealing with
9 issues we could have dealt before trial.

10 So, if your position is that's not a crime of
11 dishonesty, I don't know if it's a crime of dishonesty or
12 not. If I had an opportunity to look into it, I might find
13 that it is. Under the circumstances, on a close call, Ms.
14 Greve is going to lose.

15 Nope. You're not -- you're not going to cross examine
16 him on that.

17 Anything else we need to deal with before we bring the
18 jury in?

19 MR. NESSEL: No, sir.

20 THE COURT: All right. Just to let you know, I
21 had a scheduling conflict this evening that got cleared up,
22 so we will be doing a charge conference at the close of the
23 evidence today. Whether we finish early, we'll do it then.
24 If we're not finished with evidence by 5:00, we'll do it
25 shortly after 5:00.

1 (End of excerpt. Further proceedings followed)

2
3
4 CERTIFICATION:

5 I, Ayme A. Cochran, Official Court Reporter, certify
6 that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record
7 of proceedings in the matter of Frank Morgan,
8 Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant v. Logan County Commission,
9 et al., Defendants/Counterclaim Plaintiffs, Civil Action No.
10 2:18-cv-01450, as reported on July 29, 2020.

11
12 s/Ayme A. Cochran, RMR, CRR

January 5, 2022

13 Ayme A. Cochran, RMR, CRR

DATE